

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-01720-JAK-SSC Date: August 18, 2025

Title Joshua L. Lyons v. Jacqueline C. Jackson, et al.

Present: The Honorable Stephanie S. Christensen, U.S. Magistrate Judge

Teagan Snyder
Deputy Clerk

n/a
Court Reporter / Recorder

Attorneys Present for Plaintiffs:
None Present

Attorneys Present for Defendants:
None Present

**Proceedings: (IN CHAMBERS) Order to Show Cause Why
Action Should Not Be Dismissed for Failure to
Update Address**

On July 9, 2025, *pro se* Plaintiff Joshua L. Lyons filed this civil rights action related to unlawful detainer and other proceedings that occurred in state court. (ECF 1.) On July 11, 2025, the assigned District Judge denied Plaintiff's motion for a temporary restraining order and dismissed three claims as improperly raised in this action, because the claims had been dismissed without leave to amend in an action filed and dismissed the month prior. (ECF 10 at 2.)

Plaintiff filed "renewed" requests for a temporary restraining order (ECF 11–12), which requests were denied by the assigned District Judge on the same day that they were filed, July 15, 2025 (ECF 15.) Plaintiff was warned that "making these repetitive requests for the

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-01720-JAK-SSC Date: August 18, 2025

Title Joshua L. Lyons v. Jacqueline C. Jackson, et al.

same relief that has been previously denied is frivolous and improper,” and that similar future requests “may result in the imposition of monetary sanctions as well as an order to show cause as to why Plaintiff should not be deemed a vexatious litigant.” (ECF 15 at 3.)

Copies of the Court’s July 11th and July 15th orders were mailed to Plaintiff at his address of record after issuance. Both mailings were returned to the courthouse with stamps indicating that Plaintiff was not at the address. (ECF 20–21.) Also returned to the courthouse as undeliverable was a notice of reference to the undersigned Magistrate Judge. (ECF 19.)

Rule 41-6 of the Local Civil Rules for the Central District of California states:

Dismissal - Failure of Pro Se Plaintiff to Keep Court Apprised of Current Address. A party proceeding *pro se* must keep the Court and all other parties informed of the party’s current address as well as any telephone number and email address. If a Court order or other mail served on a *pro se* plaintiff at his address of record is returned by the Postal Service as undeliverable and the *pro se* party has not filed a notice of change of address within 14 days of the service date of the order or other Court document, the Court may dismiss the action with or without prejudice for failure to prosecute.

As Plaintiff has yet to notify the Court of a change of address, Plaintiff is ORDERED TO SHOW CAUSE in writing, no later than **August 25, 2025**, why this action should not be dismissed for failure to update his address.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

CIVIL MINUTES – GENERAL

Case No. 5:25-cv-01720-JAK-SSC Date: August 18, 2025

Title Joshua L. Lyons v. Jacqueline C. Jackson, et al.

In the event Plaintiff wishes to voluntarily dismiss this action, he may complete and return the enclosed Notice of Dismissal form, CV-09, no later than **August 25, 2025**.

If Plaintiff files a notice of change of address by **August 25, 2025**, this order to show cause will be discharged automatically, and Plaintiff need not respond to it separately.

Plaintiff is cautioned that failure to file timely a response to this order to show cause, will result in a recommendation to the District Judge to dismiss this case for failure to comply with a court order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Initials of Preparer

:

ts